

Federal Trade Commission/Office of the Secretary, Room H-135 (Annex W)
Re: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
RE: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993.

Dear Sir or Madam:

I believe the proposed Business Opportunity Rule R51 1993, as it currently reads, has the potential to keep me from being able to carry on as a Distributor with XanGo LLC, and end my operation of my small business.

My husband and I became Distributors with XanGo in the Summer of 2005, because I had taken the product and learned about the opportunity, and found the product so personally helpful that we wanted to share the product and business opportunity with others. We were sufficiently successful that we have now come to the place where we seriously rely on the additional income our XanGo business provides. We are asking you to please not ruin our small business, for that would create significant hardship on our family!

What really concerns me is that some of the sections in the proposed rule would make it hard or almost impossible for me to share my XanGo juice and marketing opportunity!

For instance, the waiting period makes it look as though there is something wrong with our product or me and plan. Besides, the proposed seven-day waiting period is unnecessary with an established, legitimate company such as ours, because XanGo already has a 30-day money back guarantee on open product, and 90-day on unopened product! I know that a seven-day waiting period would have truly frustrated me when I first got started in this business, because I was excited about the juice, as I had been using the product for a couple of weeks before I decided to become a Distributor, and would have found it very unnecessary and maddening to have to wait seven MORE days to be able to share it with others.

XanGo's Distributor kit only costs \$35.00. People buy TVs, cars, and other items that cost much more than that and they don't have to wait seven-days. Under this waiting period requirement, I will need to keep very detailed records when I first speak to someone as a prospect and will then need to send in reports to my company. I am a very small home business and this burden could really hurt or destroy my business because I don't have time to do all this added work. This proposed rule is really bad, especially for the home business entrepreneur who is just trying to supplement income to deal with the increasing energy and other costs we all face.

Worst of all, the proposed rule requires the disclosure of a minimum of 10 prior purchasers nearest to the prospective purchaser. I am glad to provide references, but

in this day of identity theft, I am really uncomfortable giving out to strangers, individuals' personal information without their consent! Females in my organization may be subject to sexual or racial harassment so this part can't go in at all, unless the FTC passes an addition to this rule Prohibiting sexual or racial attacks related to this disclosure. To be truly fair, the rule would have to bind the FTC to take direct enforcement action on sexual and racial attacks with a special unit assigned to monitor actions related to offenses or invasion of privacy from the disclosure forms!

Over the years, I've seen loads of crooked schemes on the Internet, and have been approached by many crooks because of my success. This rule will do nothing to stop the wrong doers; they will simply find ways to circumvent the rule. They hurt my business! This rule will not stop Crooks - they violate the current rule all the time, and a new one will not impress them. But I am a good American citizen and it will hurt me because I would try to comply to my best ability with these rulings, even though my product and company already have a highly ethical and appropriate system of fair treatment for both prospects and existing distributors. We do not need this proposed Rule, and it will harm hard working honest persons who make up the vast majority of the direct selling field.

Please help me keep my small business in operation without such needless stumbling blocks and confusion as this proposed rule. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sharon Thiel

The Mangosteen Answer

Warwick, RI